



Patrick W. Turner
General Attorney--South Carolina
Legal Department

AT&T South Carolina
1600 Williams Street
Suite 5200
Columbia, SC 29201

T: 803.401-2900
F: 803.254.1731
pt1285@att.com
www.att.com

April 26, 2012

The Honorable Jocelyn Boyd
Chief Clerk of the Commission
Public Service Commission of South Carolina
Post Office Drawer 11649
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Re: Complaint and Petition for Relief of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a AT&T South Carolina v. Affordable Phone Services, Inc. d/b/a High Tech Communications, Dialtone & More, Inc., Tennessee Telephone Service, LLC d/b/a Freedom Communications USA, LLC, OneTone Telecom, Inc., dPi Teleconnect, LLC and Image Access, Inc., d/b/a New Phone
Docket No. 2010-14-C, Docket No. 2010-15-C, Docket No. 2010-16-C,
Docket No. 2010-17-C, Docket No. 2010-18-C, & Docket No. 2010-19-C

Dear Ms. Boyd:

Enclosed for filing is AT&T South Carolina's Notice of Subsequent Development in Support of Its Motion for Rescission or Amendment of Decision in the above-referenced matters.

By copy of this letter, I am serving all parties of record with a copy of this pleading as indicated on the attached Certificate of Service.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrick W. Turner". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end.

Patrick W. Turner

PWT/nml
enclsoure
cc: All Parties of Record
1030138

**BEFORE THE
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

In Re: BellSouth Telecommunications, Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a
AT&T South Carolina v. Affordable Phone Services, Incorporated d/b/a
High Tech Communications
Docket No. 2010-14-C

BellSouth Telecommunications, Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a
AT&T South Carolina v. Dialtone & More Incorporated
Docket No. 2010-15-C

BellSouth Telecommunications, Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a
AT&T South Carolina v. Tennessee Telephone Service, LLC d/b/a
Freedom Communications USA, LLC
Docket No. 2010-16-C

BellSouth Telecommunications, Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a
AT&T South Carolina v. OneTone Telecom, Incorporated
Docket No. 2010-17-C

BellSouth Telecommunications, Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a
AT&T South Carolina v. dPi Teleconnect, LLC
Docket No. 2010-18-C

BellSouth Telecommunications, Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a
AT&T South Carolina v. Image Access, Incorporated d/b/a New Phone
Docket No. 2010-19-C

**AT&T SOUTH CAROLINA’S NOTICE OF SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENT IN
SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR RESCISSION OR AMENDMENT OF DECISION**

On April 26, 2012, the Louisiana Commission voted 5-0 to adopt an Administrative Law Judge’s (“ALJ’s”) recommendation¹ to rule in favor of AT&T on each of the three issues in the companion Consolidated Phase proceedings in that state. In doing so, the Louisiana Commission joined every other tribunal that has considered the issue in appropriately rejecting the Resellers’

¹ Attachment A to this Notice is a copy of the recommendation the Louisiana Commission unanimously adopted.

“wholesale must always be lower than retail” argument and found that all cashback benefits are subject to the resale discount.

This is the second recommendation issued by the ALJ in Louisiana. After hearing oral argument on the ALJ’s original recommendation adopting AT&T’s position on each issue in the Consolidated Phase proceedings, the Louisiana Commission remanded the matter to the ALJ “for further consideration of the calculation methodology to be applied to cash back promotions.”² AT&T, the Resellers, and the Louisiana Commission Staff submitted briefs and oral argument upon remand,³ and as they did before this Commission, the Resellers asked “the Commission to require AT&T [to] provide the same \$50 cash back promotion to them and not reduce that \$50 by the wholesale discount,” arguing that “this is necessary to ensure that wholesale is always less than retail.”⁴

After carefully considering these arguments on remand, the ALJ in Louisiana joined other state Commissions and the federal district court in North Carolina in appropriately rejecting the Resellers’ arguments, explaining “[w]e have thoroughly reviewed AT&T’s, the Resellers’ and Staff’s proposals⁵ and concur with AT&T’s calculations.”⁶ The ALJ explained that “[t]here are certainly times during limited promotions where the wholesale price is greater than the retail price *and this is permissible*.”⁷ Accordingly, the ALJ determined that “[w]hen the Reseller requests a valid cashback promotional credit, the Reseller receives a bill credit in the amount of the face value of the retail cashback benefit, discounted by the [Louisiana] resale

² See Attachment A at 4.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.* at 21.

⁵ The Louisiana Staff proposed two alternative methodologies to the ALJ. See Attachment A at 15.

⁶ *Id.* at 22.

⁷ *Id.* (emphasis added).

discount rate of 20.72%.”⁸ As noted above, the Louisiana Commission voted 5-0 to adopt the ALJ’s determinations.

CONCLUSION

Every other tribunal that has considered the issue has appropriately rejected the Resellers’ “wholesale must always be lower than retail” argument and found that all cashback benefits are subject to the resale discount. Accordingly, AT&T South Carolina respectfully requests that the Commission partially rescind or amend the decision reflected in its Directive of November 9, 2011 and rule that all cashback benefits are subject to the 14.8% resale discount.

Respectfully submitted on this the 26th day of April 2012.



Patrick W. Turner
General Attorney – AT&T South Carolina
1600 Williams Street
Suite 5200
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 401-2900
pt1285@att.com

1030123

⁸ *Id.* at 24.

ATTACHMENT A

LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION

DOCKET NO. U-31364

**BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. D/B/A AT&T SOUTHEAST D/B/A
AT&T LOUISIANA**

V.

IMAGE ACCESS, INC. D/B/A NEW PHONE;

BUDGET PREPAY, INC. D/B/A BUDGET PHONE D/B/A BUDGET PHONE, INC.;

**BLC MANAGEMENT, LLC D/B/A ANGLES COMMUNICATIONS SOLUTIONS D/B/A
MEXICALL COMMUNICATIONS;**

DPI TELECONNECT, LLC;

AND

**TENNESSEE TELEPHONE SERVICE, INC. D/B/A FREEDOM COMMUNICATIONS
USA, LLC**

In re: Consolidated Proceeding to Address Certain Issues Common to Dockets U-31256, U-31257, U-31258, U-31259, and U-31260.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION

**OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ON REMAND BY THE LOUISIANA
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

DRAFT ORDER

Background

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a AT&T Louisiana (“AT&T Louisiana”) has filed complaints with the Louisiana Public Service Commission (“the Commission” or “LPSC”) against Image Access, Inc. d/b/a New Phone, Budget Prepay, Inc. d/b/a Budget Phone d/b/a Budget Phone, Inc., BLC Management, LLC d/b/a Angles Communications Solutions d/b/a Mexicall Communications, and dPi Teleconnect, LLC (collectively known as the “Resellers”).

AT&T Louisiana has also filed a complaint against Tennessee Telephone Service, Inc. d/b/a Freedom Communications USA, LLC (“Tennessee Telephone”). On November 1, 2010, a Stipulation Regarding Participation in Consolidated Proceeding on Procedural Issues was filed into this consolidated docket. The stipulation outlines the Tennessee Telephone petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division. On September 24, 2010, the Bankruptcy Court entered an Agreed Order on Motion to Determine Automatic Stay Inapplicable or, Alternatively, For Relief from the Automatic Stay which, among other things, terminated, modified and annulled the automatic stay with respect to the Consolidated Proceedings in order to allow them to proceed notwithstanding the bankruptcy filing. Accordingly, AT&T Louisiana and Tennessee Telephone entered into the following stipulations:

1. As set forth in the Relief From Stay Order, Tennessee Telephone will be bound by all rulings and determinations made in the Consolidated Phase of the proceedings.
2. Tennessee Telephone has decided not to participate as a party to the Consolidated Phase of the proceedings.
3. AT&T Louisiana will not oppose any motion by Tennessee Telephone Service, Inc. d/b/a Freedom Communications USA, LLC to be removed as a party to the Consolidated Phase of the proceeding.

On February 10, 2011, AT&T and Budget Prepay, Inc. d/b/a Budget Phone f/k/a Budget Phone, Inc. (“Budget Phone”) filed a Motion to Dismiss in this proceeding, jointly moving that all claims, demands and counter-claims asserted by either of them be dismissed with prejudice, on the grounds that the parties have amicably resolved their disputes. The Commission issued

Order No. U-31364 dismissing Budget Phone as a party to consolidated docket number U-31364, with prejudice, on February 15, 2011.

On April 9, 2012, a Joint Motion to Dismiss was filed in this docket by BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a AT&T Louisiana and Image access, Inc. d/b/a NewPhone, jointly moving that all claims, demands and counter-claims asserted by either of them be dismissed with prejudice, on the grounds that the parties have amicably resolved their disputes.

On May 13, 2010, the parties in all five complaint proceedings brought by AT&T Louisiana in LPSC Dockets U-31256, U-31257, U-31258, U-31259, and U-31260, requested that the Commission convene a consolidated proceeding for the purpose of resolving certain issues common to the five complaints and common to cases pending before the regulatory commissions of eight other states (the states of the former BellSouth region). A ruling granting the Joint Motion on Procedural Issues was issued by Chief Administrative Law Judge Valerie Seal Meiners, Judge Carolyn DeVitis and Judge Michelle Finnegan on May 19, 2010.

This consolidated proceeding was instituted for the limited purpose of addressing and resolving three issues identified in the joint motion, as well as any other common issues subsequently identified and approved for consolidation. The Parties also requested that all other pending motions in the proceedings be held in abeyance while the common issues were addressed. It was determined that further proceedings in the five dockets should be stayed pending a resolution of issues in the consolidated proceeding, unless a subsequent Ruling or Order directed otherwise. The Parties, as outlined in the stipulations submitted at the time of the hearing, request a ruling on three basic issues that are to be decided in this consolidated docket, which are: Cashback Offerings, the Line Connection Charge Waiver (“LCCW”) and Referral

Marketing (“Word-of-Mouth”). A hearing was held on the consolidated issues on November 4 and 5, 2010.

A Proposed Recommendation was issued in this matter on June 22, 2011. The Resellers filed Exceptions to the Proposed Recommendation on July 12, 2011. Staff also filed exceptions on July 12, 2011. While Staff agreed with the proposed recommendation concerning the LCCW and the Word-of Mouth promotion, Staff reurged that the proper treatment of Cash Back Offerings is that proposed by Staff in its Post-Hearing Brief. AT&T Louisiana filed its Opposition Memorandum to Exceptions of Resellers and Staff on July 25, 2011. AT&T Louisiana supported the Proposed Recommendation, requesting it be issued as the Final Recommendation. After consideration of those filings, the administrative law judge issued a Final Recommendation on August 18, 2011.

At the September 7, 2011 Business and Executive session, the Commissioners voted to send this matter back to the administrative law judge for further consideration of the calculation methodology to be applied to cash back promotions.¹

In accordance with the Commission’s order, the administrative law judge reopened the case for submission of post-hearing briefs and oral arguments. After argument was heard on November 30, 2011 and after considering the existing record in accordance with the Remand Order, a Final Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge on Remand was issued. It addresses the calculation methodology to be applied to cash back promotions.

Jurisdiction and Applicable Law

The Commission holds broad power, pursuant to the Louisiana Constitution and statutes, to regulate telephone utilities and adopt reasonable and just rules, regulations, and orders

¹ Order No. U-31364, Remand Order, September 28, 2011.

affecting telecommunications services. *South Central Bell Tel. Co. v. Louisiana Public Service Commission*, 352 So.2d 999 (La.1997).

Article IV, Section 21 of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974, provides, in pertinent part, that:

The Commission shall regulate all common carriers and public utilities and have such other regulatory authority as provided by law. It shall adopt and enforce reasonable rules, regulations, and procedures necessary for the discharge of its duties and perform other duties as provided by law.

Louisiana Revised Statutes 45:1163, et seq., similarly provide that the Commission shall exercise all necessary power and authority over telephone utilities and shall adopt all reasonable and just rules, regulations and orders affecting or connected with the service and operation of such business.

Pursuant to its authority, the Commission has issued Orders addressing specific aspects of telecommunications services. Section 1101.B5 of the Commission's Local Competition Regulations provides:

Short-term promotions, which are those offered for 90 days or less, are not subject to mandatory resale. Promotions that are offered for more than ninety (90) days must be made available for resale, at the commission established discount, with the express restriction that TSPs shall only offer a promotional rate obtained from the ILEC for resale to those customers who would qualify for the promotion if they received it directly from the ILEC.

Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (codified as amended in scattered sections of 15 and 47 USC section 251 et seq.) regulates local telephone markets and imposes obligations on Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers ("ILECs") to foster competition, including requirements for ILECS to share their networks with competitors. Pursuant to 47 USC § 251(c)(4)(A), ILECS have a duty,

to offer for resale at wholesale rates any telecommunications service that the

carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not telecommunications carriers.

The wholesale price at which these services are to be provided is the retail rate less avoided costs, pursuant to 47 USC § 252(d)(3). This duty applies to promotional offerings of telecommunications services as well as to standard tariff offerings, except if the promotion is provided short term. This excludes rates that are in effect for no more than 90 days and that are not used to evade the wholesale rate obligation. 47 CFR § 51.613(a)(2). The Commission has established that avoided cost (or wholesale discount) at 20.72%, in Order U-22020, and it has been continuously applied.

STIPULATIONS FOR CONSOLIDATED PHASE

In accordance with the Joint Motion on Procedural Schedule submitted in these Dockets on June 16, 2010, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a AT&T Louisiana (“AT&T Louisiana”) and each of the Respondents in the above-referenced Dockets (collectively the “Parties”) respectfully submit the following Stipulations for use in resolving the issues presented in the Consolidated Phase of these Dockets.²

I. Introduction

The Parties agree that in the Consolidated Phase of these dockets, it is neither practical nor necessary to identify the terms and conditions of each and every retail promotional offering that may be implicated by the various pleadings in these Dockets, and the Parties have not attempted to do so in these Stipulations. Instead, the Parties submit the stipulations in Section II below to give the Commission a general description of the representative types of promotions that are addressed in the three issues in the Consolidated Phase – *i.e.*, Cashback Offerings, Referral Marketing (“Word-of-Mouth”), and Line Connection Charge Waiver (“LCCW”) – and a

² See Joint Motion on Procedural Issues submitted May 13, 2010.

general description of the representative types of AT&T retail offerings that are subject to such promotions. In Sections III and IV, the Parties provide a general description of a representative process for AT&T's retail customers and its wholesale customers to request a promotional offering. The Parties respectfully ask the Commission to address the issues in the Consolidated Phase based on these stipulations and the representative types of promotions and processes included herein.

In addressing the specific offerings in the Consolidated Phase, the Parties agree to the following:

a. Cashback and LCCW (described at page 2, paragraphs 2(a) and 2(c), respectively, of the Joint Motion on Procedural Issues). As to these offerings, the Parties ask the Commission **in this Consolidated Phase** to assume that the Parties agree that a Respondent is entitled to receive a promotional credit and **that the only dispute is the amount of the credit** to which the Respondents are entitled.³

b. Word-of-Mouth (described at page 2, paragraph 2(b) of the Joint Motion on Procedural Issues). As to this offering, the Parties ask that the Commission make an initial determination as to whether the word-of-mouth referral reward program described herein is subject to the resale obligations of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 and other applicable law. **If the Commission determines that the referral award program described herein is subject to such resale obligations**, the Parties ask that the Commission further assume that the Parties

³ Some of AT&T's cashback promotional offerings are associated with long distance services, and AT&T has denied promotional credit requests associated with such offerings. These stipulations do not address such offerings, and each Party reserves all rights to argue, in subsequent phases of these proceedings and in other forums, that such promotional offerings are or are not subject to the resale obligations of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 and other applicable law.

agree that a Respondent is entitled to receive a promotional credit and **that the only dispute is the amount of the credit** to which the Respondents are entitled.

In reaching the Stipulations below in the Consolidated Phase, no Party waives any of its rights to, after the Commission has issued an order resolving the issues in the Consolidated Phase, present evidence and arguments regarding each and every retail promotional offering that may be implicated by the various pleadings in these Dockets, including how and whether credit requests have been processed and credits issued by AT&T to any Respondent and whether a given Respondent is entitled to receive a given amount of promotional credits.

Similarly, the Parties agree that in the Consolidated Phase, it is neither practical nor necessary to address the facts specific to any Respondents' requested promotional credits, or AT&T's processing of those credits. In order to provide context for the Commission to decide the issues presented in the Consolidated Phase, however, the parties submit the stipulations in Sections III and IV below. In reaching these Stipulations in the Consolidated Phase, no Party waives any of its rights, after the Commission has issued an order resolving the issues in the Consolidated Phase, to present additional evidence and arguments as to retail and wholesale requests for any offerings that are being or have been processed.

II. Representative Description of Promotions

a. Cashback Offerings

1. Attachment A to these Stipulations are representative descriptions of various Cashback Offerings. Attachment B to these Stipulations are representative descriptions of retail services and prices that are the subject of these representative Cashback Offerings, and the parties stipulate that additional representative

descriptions of retail services and prices that are the subject of these representative

Cashback Offerings are available at:

<http://cpr.bellsouth.com/pdf/la/a996.pdf>

<http://cpr.bellsouth.com/pdf/la/g996.pdf#page=1>

b. Word-of-Mouth Offerings

2. Attachment C to these Stipulations is a representative description of a “Word-of-Mouth” Referral Offering.

c. LCCW Offerings

3. Attachment D to these Stipulations are representative descriptions of various LCCW Offerings. Attachment B to these Stipulations are representative descriptions of the retail services and prices that are the subject of these representative LCCW Offerings, and the parties stipulate that additional representative descriptions of retail services and prices that are the subject of these representative LCCW Offerings are available at:

<http://cpr.bellsouth.com/pdf/la/a996.pdf>

<http://cpr.bellsouth.com/pdf/la/g996.pdf#page=1>

III. AT&T’s Procedure for Processing a Retail Request for a Promotional Offering

4. An AT&T retail customer is billed the standard retail price for the telecommunications services subject to a “cashback” promotional offering. The AT&T retail customer then requests the benefits of the cashback promotion either on-line or by mailing in a form within the allowable time period as described in the terms and conditions of the particular promotion. If the retail customer meets the

qualifications of the promotional offering, AT&T mails a check, gift card, or other item (as described in the promotional offering) to the retail customer's billing address. This process is further described by AT&T in "frequently asked questions" found at <https://rewardcenter.att.com/FAQ.aspx>. Attachment E to these Stipulations is a copy of this description.

5. At the time an AT&T retail customer requests a "LCCW" promotional offering, an AT&T retail representative determines whether the retail customer meets all qualifications of the offering. If the retail customer meets those qualifications, the line connection charge is waived.
6. If an existing AT&T retail customer refers a potential customer to AT&T and the potential customer orders service(s) that qualify for the "Word-of-Mouth" Referral Offering, the AT&T customer referring the new customer to AT&T may be entitled [to] a referral benefit. In order to process the request for the benefit, the referring AT&T retail customer requests the benefits of the promotion on-line by: (1) registering in the program; (2) nominating a potential customer before that customer orders qualifying service(s) from AT&T; and (3) after the potential customer orders qualifying service(s) from AT&T, providing that customer's account information to AT&T online. If the referring retail customer meets the qualifications of the promotional offering, AT&T mails a gift card or other item (as described in the promotional offering) to that retail customer's billing address. The AT&T retail customer that refers a potential customer as set forth above is billed the standard retail price for the telecommunications services he or she purchases from AT&T.

IV. AT&T's Procedure for Processing a Wholesale Request for a Promotional Offering

7. When a Respondent purchases for resale the telecommunications services that are subject to any of the offerings described herein, AT&T bills the Respondent the wholesale rate (the retail rate less the 20.72% residential resale discount established by this Commission) for those telecommunications services.
8. After being billed by AT&T, the Respondent submits promotional credit requests seeking any credits to which it believes it is entitled pursuant to the offering.⁴
9. Upon receipt of these requests, AT&T reviews them to determine whether it believes the Respondent is entitled to the credits it requests. To the extent AT&T determines that the Respondent is entitled to the requested credits, AT&T applies the credits that it believes are due on a subsequent bill to the Respondent.⁵
10. For purposes of this Consolidated Phase, the Parties agree that AT&T did not seek prior approval from the Commission regarding the methodology it used to calculate the amount of promotional credits to Respondents that are the subject of the Consolidated Phase.

Witnesses

Dr. William Taylor, an employee of National Economic Research Associates, Inc., testifying on behalf of AT&T.

Joseph Gillan, an economist with a consulting practice specializing in telecommunications, testifying on behalf of the Resellers.

⁴ Those stipulations address only the process for the 9-state former BellSouth region and not the process for the other 13 states in which an AT&T entity operates as an ILEC.

⁵ As mentioned above, neither Respondents nor AT&T stipulate that AT&T has or has not processed or applied all credits that AT&T has deemed are due, and neither Respondents nor AT&T stipulate that AT&T has or has not processed all credits that are actually due.

Christopher Klein, an Associate Professor in the Economics and Finance Department of Middle Tennessee State University, testifying on behalf of Resellers.

Overview of Party Positions

AT&T Louisiana's Positions

AT&T Louisiana uses a two-step process to resell a telecommunications service that is subject to a retail cashback promotion: (1) a reseller orders the requested telecommunications service and is billed the standard wholesale price of the service (which is the standard retail price of the service discounted by the 20.72% resale discount rate established by the Commission); and (2) the reseller requests a cashback promotional credit which, if verified as valid by AT&T Louisiana, results in the reseller receiving a bill credit in the amount of the face value of the retail cashback benefit discounted by the 20.72% resale discount rate established by the Commission. The issue becomes whether the 20.72% resale discount rate is to be applied to the standard retail price of the affected service and not to the cashback benefit or to the retail promotional price of the service. AT&T Louisiana avers it is correctly applying the 20.72% resale discount rate to the promotional price of the service.

AT&T Louisiana argues that the Resellers position concerning LCCW is incorrect because discounting the \$0 retail price by 20.72% produces a wholesale price of \$0. It avers it is not only the mathematically accurate result, but also the result envisioned by the 1996 Act. The controlling statute provides that wholesale prices shall be set “on the basis of retail rates charged to subscribers for the telecommunications service requested, excluding the portion thereof attributable to [costs avoided by the ILEC].”

Concerning the word-of-mouth program, AT&T Louisiana argues that these referrals are marketing promotions and are not subject to resale. Resale obligations apply only to

“telecommunications services” AT&T Louisiana provides at retail, and a marketing referral program like “word-of-mouth” is not even arguably a telecommunications service. Rather it is a marketing activity that AT&T induces from its customers.

The Resellers Positions

The Resellers state this docket is about preserving the viability of wholesale competition and the efficacy of federal pricing rules. They espouse in their post-hearing brief at page 2:

At issue is whether retail should be less than wholesale – that is, whether AT&T’s retail price for telecommunication services should ever be less than the wholesale price at which AT&T resells those services to competitive local exchange carriers (CLEC”) such as the Resellers. Obviously, it should not: the whole concept behind requiring Incumbent Local exchange Carriers (“ILECs”) like AT&T to resell their services at wholesale rates hinges on retail rates being greater than wholesale rates. Nevertheless, the Louisiana Public Service Commission (“Commission”) is here confronted with the problem that AT&T’s use of “cashback” promotions, combined with its failure to extend the full value of those promotions to the Resellers, results in retail prices less than wholesale. AT&T’s promotional pricing practices are unreasonable, discriminatory, and contrary to the requirements and purposes of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (“FTA”) and the FCC’s rules on resale.

The Resellers state the question before the Commission is how to calculate the amount the Resellers are entitled to when reselling services subject to cash back, LCCW and referral (or word of mouth) promotions for the month in which the promotion is earned. They argue that no other months are in dispute. The FTA and federal regulations set the resale rate for telecommunications services that an ILEC may charge as “the rate for the telecommunications service, less avoided retail costs, as described in section 51.609. Thus, the “wholesale discount” must by law be calculated as the avoided cost. The Resellers argue that the appropriate method for determining the wholesale price is to first calculate the amount of the avoided cost, then subtract the avoided cost from the actual sales price.

Resellers state that to properly determine the avoided cost, one multiplies the resale discount factor times the standard/tariffed price. This gives one the base amount of the avoided cost, and thus the amount by which the wholesale amount should be less than the retail price. They argue this is because the costs associated with the service remain the same, even if the price is temporarily changed for a particular customer pursuant to a special sale or promotion. They state that it also makes sense to measure the avoided costs based on the standard/tariffed retail rate because that is how the model was originally designed, years prior to the introduction of cashback and other promotions. The resellers state the three steps to finding the wholesale price are:

STEP 1: Find the pre-promotion standard/tariffed retail price.

STEP 2: Find the avoided cost: multiply the standard/tariffed retail price by the wholesale discount factor.

STEP 3: Subtract the avoided cost from the retail sales price, which is the standard/tariffed price, or, if a promotion applies, the price after applying the promotion.

By applying this method, they state, the wholesale price is always the same amount less than the retail price which, as AT&T's witness acknowledged, is what the FCC intended.

The Resellers further state that they are entitled to the full value of AT&T's cash back promotions because according to the FTA and pertinent FCC regulations, AT&T is required to offer its services for resale "subject to the same conditions" that AT&T offers its own end-users and at "the rate for the telecommunications service less avoided retail costs." There are scenarios where this would result in AT&T giving credit balances to the Resellers.

The LPSC Staff's Position

Staff concludes that:

1) the proper wholesale rate applicable when a “cashback” promotion is offered is the “effective retail price” of the telecommunications service multiplied by the LPSC’s 20.72% avoided cost. Staff uses the following equation: Wholesale Rate = (Retail Rate) – (Cash-back) x (Discount).

2) credits to resellers for the WLCC promotion should be equal to the amount the reseller was charged for the service; and

3) word-of-mouth promotions should not be available for resale.

On remand, Staff adopts a compromise position concerning cashback promotions that result in a negative price scenario. Staff states that AT&T’s methodology results in a greater benefit being provided to its retail customers than is provided to wholesale customers when the effective price is negative.⁶ “In simple terms, AT&T should provide the same credit amount to a reseller than [sic] it provides to its retail customers, if the cash-back amount is greater than the price of the service.”⁷ Staff requests that the Commission adopt the position advanced by Staff with respect to the correct treatment of “cash-back” promotions. In the alternative, Staff respectfully requests consideration of Staff’s alternative compromise that ensures Resellers receive equal benefits to those received by retail customers.

Issues and Analysis

All parties to this proceeding are to be complimented for their work in narrowing down the issues to be addressed by the Commission. The Joint Stipulation specifically requests that three

⁶ Staff’s Brief on Remand, page 4.

⁷ Staff’s Brief on Remand, page 6.

issues be decided. Since there is no need to review any individual promotions or offers, the Commission, upon a review of pre-filed testimony, exhibits, testimony elicited at the hearing and briefs on the issues, answers the questions presented to it by the Parties as succinctly as possible.

Cashback Offerings

The Parties have requested for the Commission to assume that the Parties agree that Resellers are entitled to receive a promotional credit for cashback offerings. The Parties state the only dispute is the amount of the credit to which the Resellers are entitled.

Resale services must be sold at wholesale prices established by state commissions based on the retail rate less avoided costs. 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(3). The duty to sell services to resellers at wholesale prices applies to promotional offerings of telecommunications services as well as to standard tariff offerings, except if the promotion is provided short term (i.e., rates that are in effect for no more than 90 days and that are not used to evade the wholesale rate obligation). 47 C.F.R. § 51.613(a)(2); See *BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. v. Sanford*, 494 F.3d 439 (4th Cir. 2007) (“Sanford”). The cashback offerings in this case are based upon a one-time rebate that is applied as a credit to AT&T retail customers as well as the Resellers. It is not necessary to determine what length of time must be considered in evaluating the promotions. AT&T grants the rebates to its customers if they stay for 30 days and complete the requisite paperwork. The same time frame applies to the Resellers.

Cashback offerings are used to entice customers to purchase service. A cashback promotion is a reduction in the price of a service and does not result in a change to tariffed rates. In the instance of AT&T, it is hoped that using such enticements will result in customers who will not only purchase the service, but keep it long term. “It would be irrational for AT&T to offer cashback promotions to woo customers who will stay with the company for only one

month; . . . a proper understanding of the economics of a cashback promotion necessarily looks at a longer term.”⁸ The ruling in *Stanford* holds that if these cashback offerings are offered for more than 90 days, the promotional rates shall be available for resale at the wholesale discount. These promotions need not be refunded to the Resellers’ customers. The Resellers are entitled to receive the cashback incentive in the month earned. It need not be averaged over several months.

A Reseller that requests a telecommunications service is to be billed the standard wholesale price of the service (which is the standard retail price of the service discounted by the 20.72% resale discount rate established by this Commission). When the Reseller requests a valid cashback promotional credit, the Reseller first receives a bill credit in the amount of the face value of the retail cashback benefit. AT&T discounts the retail cashback benefit by the 20.72% resale discount rate established by the Commission. Resellers oppose this practice of deducting the resale discount rate from the cashback benefit. Resellers argue that the avoided costs (the wholesale discount percentage of 20.7%) should not be applied to the promotional cash back amount but should only be applied to standard retail prices. Resellers argue that by AT&T taking this deduction, particularly when it results in a credit to AT&T’s retail customers, it results in a pricing situation where the wholesale price is greater than the retail price. Resellers argue that wholesale must always be less than retail.

Avoided costs are calculated as a percentage of the retail price. This amount is then deducted from the retail price. It is a basic mathematical equation. Thus, avoided costs vary with the retail price. As the retail price increases, so does the amount attributable to the avoided costs. Accordingly, the lower the retail price, the lower the amount of the avoided costs.

⁸ Reply brief of AT&T page 14.

AT&T's method of calculation is correct. Although this theory does not embrace the calculation methods proposed by the Resellers or Staff, this result is consistent with the FCC's Local Competition Order and the orders of this Commission.

Example 1, with no promotional discount, the following calculation would apply:⁹

AT&T Standard Retail Price		\$30
Estimated Avoided Costs = Standard Retail Price x 20%	(\$30 x 20% = \$6)	\$ 6
Wholesale Price (Standard Retail Price minus Estimated Avoided Costs)	\$30-\$6 =	\$24

Therefore, the Resellers pay \$24 for the services purchased from AT&T.

Example 2, with a \$10 promotional discount (lasting over 90 days), the following calculation would apply:

Standard Retail Price		\$30
Minus \$10 promotional discount	--	<u>\$10</u>
Net or Effective Retail price		\$20
Estimated Avoided Costs = Standard Retail Price x 20%	(\$20 x 20% = \$4)	\$ 4
Wholesale Price (Net or Effective Retail Price minus Estimated Avoided Costs)		
	\$20-\$4 =	\$16

Therefore, the Resellers pay \$16 for the services purchased from AT&T.

Example 3, with a \$50 promotional discount (lasting over 90 days), the following calculation would apply:

⁹ A hypothetical 20% wholesale discount percentage is used for demonstration purposes and mathematical ease only.

Standard Retail Price	\$30
Minus \$50 promotion	<u>\$-50</u>
Net or Effective Retail price	\$-20

Given the scenario in Example 3, how much do the Resellers pay or receive, under these circumstances? It appears that all parties are in agreement as to the calculation of the Resellers' wholesale price in Examples 1 and 2. It is when the cashback promotion results in a credit to the AT&T retail customer that disputes about how to calculate the Resellers price (or credit) arise between the parties. This topic is in dispute in many venues. In this case alone, numerous briefs, extensive testimony, charts and calculations have been submitted to the Commission concerning how to handle this specific situation. AT&T, the Resellers and Staff have each proposed solutions and all are different.

AT&T's approach:

AT&T's wholesale price to Resellers	\$24
Total cashback [cashback offer less estimated avoided costs(\$50 x 20%)]	<u>(40)</u>
Net amount paid	\$(16)

The Resellers approach

AT&T's wholesale price to Resellers	\$24
Total cashback [cashback equals promotional offer to retail customers]	<u>(50)</u>
Net amount paid	\$(26)

Staff's Compromise Approach

Standard Retail Price	\$30
Minus \$50 promotion	<u>\$-50</u>
Net amount paid	\$-20

AT&T contends that Staff's formula is flawed because it adds the avoided cost estimate rather than subtracting it, causing AT&T to give resellers a high credit, which therefore increases the expense of the promotion to AT&T. AT&T postulates that "by making it more expensive for AT&T to offer these promotions, Staff's proposed new formula would discourage these pro-competitive promotions that are beneficial to consumers in Louisiana."¹⁰ AT&T claims that the formula Staff proposes is an approach that was not addressed at the hearing. The Resellers aver that the Staff's proposal was not novel. The Resellers urge that the formula is the same as "Taylor's formula corrected for reality" proposed during the hearing by Reseller Witness Mr. Joseph Gillan and illustrated on Reseller Exhibit #4. AT&T contends that the formula it uses is the long standing fundamental formula Staff supports in all other circumstances. Staff correctly posits this as an alternative method of calculation.

The Resellers argue that they should receive the full-value of the cash-back promotion (\$50). Resellers also aver that the value of the promotion should not be reduced by the wholesale discount rate applied to resale of regular services. In this example, for each eligible rebate, the Resellers want AT&T to provide the service for the Resellers' customer (a value of \$24) and pay the Reseller \$26. This would make the Wholesale Price \$-26, or \$6 less than the net or effective retail price. The Resellers argue that wholesale must always be less than retail.

¹⁰ Reply brief of AT&T page 14

In other words, the AT&T retail customer who qualified for the \$50 cashback promotion would pay the standard retail price of \$30. Then, upon AT&T's satisfaction that the retail customer qualified for the cashback promotion, the retail customer would receive a credit of \$50, so that particular retail customer would effectively receive the service for free that month and get the equivalent of \$20 back from AT&T. This results in a net or effective retail price of -\$20.

The Resellers are asking the Commission to require AT&T provide the same \$50 cash back promotion to them and not reduce that \$50 by the wholesale discount. It is Resellers position that this is necessary to ensure that wholesale is always less than retail. The Resellers want the \$50 cash back promotion deducted from the wholesale price of \$24. This necessarily results in a "negative" price. For example: An AT&T retail customer would pay the Standard Retail Price of \$30 and receive \$50 from AT&T in a cashback promotion, as outlined in the preceding paragraph. This results in the AT&T customer being issued a credit that results in a credit to their account of \$20.

The Resellers' argument yields the following result:

Standard Retail Price		\$30
Estimated Avoided Costs = Standard Retail Price x 20%	--	<u>\$ 6</u>
Wholesale Price (Standard Retail Promotional Price minus Estimated Avoided Costs)		\$24
Net or Effective Retail Price with a \$50 cashback promotion	--	<u>\$50</u>
	--	\$26

The Resellers would receive a credit from AT&T of \$26, thus making the net effective retail price -\$26. The Resellers urge that this is the correct application because it provides them with a lower price than AT&T's retail customers, or "wholesale must always be less than retail". This

is not always the case. There are certainly times during limited promotions where the wholesale price is greater than the retail price and this is permissible. The Resellers are not entitled to the entire rebate because they will receive a reimbursement that is greater than the price they paid for the service. The Resellers do not pay the net or effective retail price. They pay less because the percentage attributable to the avoided costs is deducted from the price AT&T charges Resellers.

If the same scenario were applied to “positive” numbers you would have the following: Standard Retail Price is \$100. AT&T provides a \$50 cashback promotion and the retail customer winds up paying \$50 for the service. The Resellers would only pay \$40 for the same service.

Is the 20.72% resale discount rate to be applied to the standard retail price of the affected service and not to the cashback benefit or to the retail promotional price of the service? Currently, when the Reseller requests a valid cashback promotional credit, the Reseller receives a bill credit in the amount of the face value of the retail cashback benefit, discounted by the resale discount rate of 20.72%. AT&T argues that this is the correct calculation: applying the 20.72% resale discount rate to the promotional price of the service. We have thoroughly reviewed AT&T’s, the Resellers’ and Staff’s proposals and concur with AT&T’s calculation. To do otherwise results in the Resellers being paid to take service from AT&T. The Resellers should be entitled to no more credit for the cash-back component than it would be entitled to if AT&T had simply reduced the retail price of the affected service by the same amount.

This Commission finds that when AT&T extends cashback offerings to its retail customers for more than 90 days, the promotional rates shall be available for resale to the Resellers. The Reseller requesting a telecommunications service is to be billed the standard wholesale price of the service. The standard wholesale price of the service equals the net or

effective retail price of the service discounted by the resale discount rate previously established by this Commission as 20.72%.

Waiver of Line Connection Charge

The Parties have stipulated that the Resellers are entitled to receive a promotional credit for the LCCW and that the only dispute is the amount of the credit to which the Resellers are entitled. An AT&T retail customer normally incurs a charge for the line connection. As a result of the LCCW, the retail customer is charged nothing. The Resellers are charged the line connection charge at the applicable wholesale discount. If the Resellers qualify for the LCCW, they are then credited back the amount initially charged. For example, if the line connection charge is \$50, the retail customer is charged \$50. However, if the LCCW is granted the retail customer pays nothing. The amount that the Resellers are entitled to is the line connection charge, less the applicable wholesale discount. Using 20% (for ease of calculation) as the applicable wholesale discount, the Resellers will pay \$40. The Resellers are entitled to a credit of the amount paid, namely \$40. Under the Reseller's proposal, the LCCW would amount to a rebate and thus the full amount, prior to the application of the wholesale discount, must be credited to the Reseller. We agree with Staff's conclusion that the application espoused by the Resellers can result in a situation where AT&T pays the Resellers to connect its customers. Accordingly, the proper method for applying the waiver of the line connection charge is to provide a credit to Resellers equal to the amount previously charged to the Resellers.

Word of Mouth Promotion

The Parties ask that the Commission make an initial determination as to whether the word-of-mouth referral reward program described herein is subject to the resale obligations of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 and other applicable law. They propose that if the

Commission determines that the referral award program is subject to such resale obligations, that the Commission assume the Parties agree a Reseller is entitled to receive a promotional credit and determine the amount of the credit to which the Resellers are entitled.

The Commission agrees with the positions of Staff and AT&T Louisiana that word-of-mouth is a promotion that is not subject to resale. Retail customers of AT&T can receive promotional benefits such as cash or gift cards under word-of-mouth promotions. The retail customers, who choose to participate in said program, convince friends and family members who are not currently retail customers of AT&T to purchase particular services. The retail customers who convinced friends and family members to sign up for AT&T's offerings must then apply to receive the cash or near-cash offerings. This word-of-mouth referral is not a "telecommunications service" AT&T provides at retail. It is the result of AT&T's marketing referral program and should not be subject to resale.

In accordance with the conclusions reached in this consolidated docket;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that when AT&T extends cashback offerings to its retail customers for more than 90 days, the promotional rates shall be available for resale to the Resellers at the wholesale discount. A Reseller that requests a telecommunications service is to be billed the standard wholesale price of the service. This equals the standard retail price of the service discounted by the resale discount rate established by this Commission. The Commission has previously established the resale discount rate as 20.72%. When the Reseller requests a valid cashback promotional credit, the Reseller receives a bill credit in the amount of the face value of the retail cashback benefit, discounted by the resale discount rate of 20.72%.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the Resellers are entitled to receive a promotional credit for the LCCW, the Resellers are entitled to a credit of the LCCW, less the applicable resale discount rate.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that word-of-mouth promotions are not a “telecommunications service”. The word-of-mouth promotion is the result of AT&T’s marketing referral program and is not subject to resale.

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA**

**DISTRICT II
CHAIRMAN JAMES M. FIELD**

**DISTRICT IV
VICE CHAIRMAN CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY**

**DISTRICT V
COMMISSIONER FOSTER L. CAMPBELL**

**DISTRICT III
COMMISSIONER LAMBERT C. BOISSIERE, III**

**EVE KAHAO GONZALEZ
SECRETARY**

**DISTRICT I
COMMISSIONER ERIC F. SKRMETTA**

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
) CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

The undersigned, Nyla M. Laney, hereby certifies that she is employed by the Legal Department for BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T South Carolina (“AT&T”) and that she has caused AT&T South Carolina’s Notice of Subsequent Development in Support of Its Motion for Rescission or Amendment of Decision in Docket Nos. 2010-14-C, 2010-15-C, 2010-16-C, 2010-17-C, 2010-18-C and 2010-19-C to be served upon the following on April 26, 2012:

John J. Pringle, Jr., Esquire
Ellis, Lawhorne & Sims, P.A.
1501 Main Street
5th Floor
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
(Affordable Phone Services, Inc. d/b/a High Tech)
(Dialtone & More, Inc.)
(Tennessee Telephone Service, LLC d/b/a Freedom Communications)
(OneTone Telecom, Inc.)
(dPi Teleconnect, L.L.C.)
(Image Access, Inc. d/b/a NewPhone)
(Electronic Mail)

Christopher Malish, Esquire
Malish & Cowan, P.L.L.C.
1403 West Sixth Street
Austin, Texas 78703
(dPi Teleconnect, LLC)
(Electronic Mail)

Henry M. Walker, Esquire
Bradley Arant Boult Cummings, LLP
1600 Division Street, Suite 700
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(OneTone Telecom, Inc.)
(Tennessee Telephone Service, LLC d/b/a Freedom
Communications)
(DialTone & More, Inc.)
(Electronic Mail)

Barbara Miller
Kelley Drye & Warren
Washington Harbour, Suite 400
3050 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20007
(Affordable Phone Services, Inc., d/b/a High Tech
Communications)
(Electronic Mail)

John J. Heitman
Kelley Drye & Warren
Washington Harbour, Suite 400
3050 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20007
(Affordable Phone Services, Inc., d/b/a High Tech
Communications)
(Electronic Mail)


Paul F. Guarisco
W. Bradley Kline
PHELPS DUNBAR LLP
II City Plaza, 400 Convention Street, Suite 1100
Post Office Box 4412
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821
(Image Access, Inc. d/b/a NewPhone)
(Electronic Mail)

C. Lessie Hammonds, Esquire
Counsel
Office of Regulatory Staff
1401 Main Street, Suite 900
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(Electronic Mail)

F. David Butler, Esquire
Senior Counsel
S. C. Public Service Commission
Post Office Box 11649
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
(PSC Staff)
(Electronic Mail)

Joseph Melchers
General Counsel
S.C. Public Service Commission
Post Office Box 11649
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
(PSC Staff)
(Electronic Mail)

Jocelyn G. Boyd, Esquire
Chief Clerk
S. C. Public Service Commission
Post Office Box 11649
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
(PSC Staff)
(Electronic Mail)



Nyla M. Laney

800715